

Appl. No. 09/887,198
Amdt. dated September 1, 2005
Request for continued examination following final office action of May 3, 2005

REMARKS

This amendment accompanies the filing of a REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION following a final Office Action mailed May 3, 2005. The final Office Action rejected Applicants' Claims 18, 20-22 and 24-28 as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,414,602 ("Polyakov") and rejected Claims 1-17, 19 and 23 as obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Publication 2004/0076279 ("Taschereau") and Polyakov.

With this response, Applicants have canceled Claims 18-27 and amended Claims 1, 7, 13 and 28. Although the Applicants do not believe that these claims are anticipated or obvious in view of the cited prior art, Applicants have canceled and amended them in order to further prosecution at this time and reserves the right to pursue them in a continuation application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the following remarks. Applicants submit that Claims 1-17 and 28 are in condition for allowance.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 28

Claim 28 relates to a method for delivering advertising to users of mobile computing platforms. Claim 28 recites the step of dynamically forming a new advertising zone associated with the determined position of the mobile computing platform. The new advertising zone is not defined prior to the forming step. Polyakov does not anticipate this claim at least for the reason that Polyakov does not disclose forming a new advertising zone which is not defined prior to this step. In contrast, the Polyakov system determines which one of a plurality of different predefined zones the mobile billboard is located. (see: Polyakov: column 3, lines 18-21). That is, the Polyakov system merely identifies a static, old, prior established zone in which the mobile billboard is located instead of dynamically forming a new zone which did not exist prior to this forming step.

The Office Action indicated that the mobile billboard traveling from one zone to the next is equivalent to the Applicants' dynamically forming a new zone. (see: Office Action: page 5). Applicants respectfully point out that moving from one static, old, prior established

Appl. No. 09/887,198

Amdt. dated September 1, 2005

Request for continued examination following final office action of May 3, 2005

zone to the next static, old prior established zone does not disclose or suggest the Applicants' recited feature of dynamically forming a new zone which did not exist prior to this forming step. In contrast, the advertising zones of the Polyakov system all exist prior to this step. Thus, Polyakov completely fails to suggest the additional step of dynamically forming a new zone.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Polyakov does not anticipate Applicants' Claim 28.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1

Claim 1 relates to a method of facilitating delivery of advertising to users of mobile computing platforms. Claim 1 recites a geographic database containing road segment data that represents a road segment located in a geographic region. The road segment data comprises data that indicates in which of the advertising zones the road segment is located. Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of Polyakov and Taschereau because the combination does not disclose or suggest the claim element of the road segment data comprising data that indicates in which of the advertising zones the road segment is located.

First, Polyakov completely fails to disclose the recited geographic database with road segment data. Polyakov does not disclose or suggest the road segment data comprising data that indicates in which of the advertising zones the road segment is located.

Second, the Office Action relied upon Taschereau as disclosing the claimed features of the geographic database (*see*: Advisory Action: pages 2-3). However, Applicants respectfully point out that the Taschereau patent fails to disclose or suggest the claim element of the road segment data comprising data that indicates in which of the advertising zones the road segment is located. Although Taschereau discloses the geographic database including road segment data, the road segment data of Taschereau does not comprise data that indicates in which the advertising zone the road segment is located. Rather, the Taschereau patent discloses organizing the road segments into named groups that facilitate the recognition of the natural language speaking patterns of the caller. For example, the named groups of road segments may correspond to a name representing a city, city district or street segment group

Appl. No. 09/887,198

Amdt. dated September 1, 2005

Request for continued examination following final office action of May 3, 2005

(the name "Georgia" corresponds to street segments of "Georgia St.," "West Georgia," and so on). (*see*: Taschereau: page 4, paragraph 0059, lines 1-5; paragraph 0071-73). The named groups of road segments facilitate efficient lookup of the caller's natural language location by providing a list of segments that apply to the name of the group allowing the system to identify the road segment in the database corresponding to the caller's verbal description. (*see*: Taschereau: page 5, paragraph 0077; paragraph 0082). In summary, the Taschereau patent discloses the group of road segments being associated with a name that enables matching with voice commands. The Taschereau patent fails to disclose road segment data comprising data that indicates in which advertising zone the road segment is located.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants' independent Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the combination of Polyakov and Taschereau.

Claim 7

Claim 7 relates to a method of facilitating delivery of advertising to users of geographic data. Claim 7 recites a geographic database that contains road segment data and advertising area data. The advertising area data indicates which of the road segments are located in the advertising areas. As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1, Claim 7 is not obvious in view of the combination of Polyakov and Taschereau because the combination fails to disclose this claim element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants' independent Claim 7 is not obvious in view of the combination of Polyakov and Taschereau.

Claim 13

Claim 13 relates to a geographic database. Claim 12 recites road segment data that represent road segments and advertising zone data. The advertising zone data indicates which of a plurality of advertising zones the road segments are located in. As discussed above in conjunction with Claim 1, Claim 13 is not obvious in view of the combination of Polyakov and Taschereau because the combination fails to disclose this claim element. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants' independent Claim 13 is not obvious in view of the combination of Polyakov and Taschereau.

Appl. No. 09/887,198

Amtd. dated September 1, 2005

Request for continued examination following final office action of May 3, 2005

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-17

Applicants' dependent Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-17 are allowable at least for the reason that they depend upon allowable base claims. In addition, these claims include features that are not disclosed by the cited references.

Petition for extension of time

Included with this response is a request for an extension of time to reply to the final Office Action dated May 3, 2005. Included with this response is an authorization for payment of the fee associated with this request.

Conclusion

With the present response, all the issues in the final Office Action mailed May 3, 2005 have been addressed. Applicants submit that the present application has been placed in condition for allowance. If any issues remain, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jon D. Shutter
Reg. No. 41,311
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
222 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60654
(312) 894-7000 x7365